

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests consideration and entry of the above amendments even though presented after a final rejection. Applicant submits that the amendments represent patentable subject matter over the cited prior art, and do not raise new issues or require a new search. Further, consideration and entry of the amendments may place the claims in better condition for appeal, if necessary, by reducing the outstanding issues. The amendments were not presented earlier in the prosecution due to a better understanding of the Examiner's position as reflected in the latest Office Action.

Claims 1-26 remain in this application. Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19 and 20 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-26 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,407,996 (Witchalls) in view of USPN 6,490,275 (Sengodan). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-26 define over Witchalls in view of Sengodan. In finding Applicant's previous arguments unpersuasive, the Office Action states that "the applications computers as claimed have to be capable of executing telephony applications; however, none of the claims as currently presented recites this limitation." Office Action, Page 3, Paragraph 6. Independent claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19 and 20 have been amended to recite the feature of an "application computer arranged to execute applications using call control information." Witchalls discloses computers 302-308, 316, 317, 410, 420 and 499. None of these computers, however, comprise an application computer as recited in the claims. Similarly, Sengodan fails to describe an "application computer arranged to

execute applications using call control information.” Since Witchalls and Sengodan fail to disclose all the recited elements of the claims, the claims represent patentable subject matter over Witchall and Sengodan, whether taken alone or in combination. Further, the cited documents do not disclose a teaching, suggestion or motivation to combine the described systems in an attempt to arrive at the claimed subject matter.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-26 recite novel features not shown by the cited documents. Further, Applicant submits that the above-recited novel features provide new and unexpected results not recognized by the cited documents. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are not anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited documents. Removal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

It is believed that claims 1-26 are in allowable form. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-3387 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Appl. No. 09/809,501

Amendment Dated 3/31/2004

Reply to Office Action of December 31, 2003 (Paper No. 11)

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP


John F. Kacvinsky, Reg. No. 40,040

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on: 3/31/04.


Deborah Higham

3/31/04
Date

Dated: 3/31/04

12400 Wilshire Blvd., 7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025